

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 have been amended and claims 54-56 have been added as shown on pp. 2-8 of the Reply.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Keefer for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview conducted on March 31, 2009. Examiner was contacted to discuss the Examiner's rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants' representative respectfully submits that amendments to the claims have been made along the lines of this discussion. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is thus respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 1

Claim 1 is objected to because of minor informalities cited by the Examiner. Claim 1 has been amended so as to remove the language objected to by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph. As indicated during the telephonic interview, the subject claims have been amended so as to remove the language cited by the Examiner as allegedly failing to comply with the written requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,781,901 to Kuzma (hereinafter "Kuzma") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0009571 to Bavadekar (hereinafter "Bavadekar"). It is respectfully submitted that Kuzma either alone or in combination with Bavadekar does not obviate every limitation of the rejected claims. In particular, this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

The rejected claims generally recite a message device comprising at least one processor, a local buffer, a message sender component, and a message receiver component. Without

acquiescence to the Examiner's rejection, in the interest of expediting prosecution and clarifying the claimed subject matter, applicants' representative has amended independent claim 1. As amended, claim 1 recites *inter alia* "a message sender component configured to facilitate **transmitting** a first tag-based message...the first tag-based message including **a portion retained by [a] local buffer** and a remaining portion of the first tag-based message, wherein **the remaining portion and a reference to the portion retained by the local buffer are concurrently transmitted.**" Claim 1 further recites "a message receiver component configured to facilitate **receiving** a second tag-based message...the second tag-based message includes a reference to a portion of the second tag-based message retained by [an] external buffer." (See e.g., Published Application, Paragraphs 0028-0036 & Figures 2A-2C)

As indicated during the telephonic interview, Kuzma does not disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Kuzma generally relates to transmitting e-mail by using a configurable e-mail page of the recipient. Specifically, Kuzma discloses an "HTTP-only" e-mail system which provides e-mail services that only utilize HTTP, with no necessity of accessing a separate e-mail application in addition to the HTTP web-browser being utilized. (See Kuzma, Column 12, lines 54-58). However, Kuzma simply teaches that a sender may utilize this system to include a message and URL hypertext link onto a recipient's mail page. (See Kuzma, Column 14, lines 3-8). Moreover, as discussed during the telephonic interview, nowhere does Kuzma disclose utilizing this *same* system to also **receive** a tag-based message from the recipient.

Bavadekar does not cure the deficiencies of Kuzma. Bavadekar is generally directed towards providing transport protocol tunnel connections between entities such as clients and servers in a messaging system. To facilitate providing such connections, Bavadekar discloses that a client may send an HTTP request packet to a Web server to indicate that the client is ready to receive HTTP packets buffered in a buffer for the client. (See Bavadekar, Paragraph 0090). Bavadekar further discloses that each client may periodically send HTTP request packets to retrieve buffered HTTP packets from the Web server, wherein a separate thread on a client may be responsible for periodically sending the HTTP request packets. However, similar to Kuzma, nowhere does Bavadekar disclose transmitting **and** retrieving packets from the *same* device. For at least these reasons, Kuzma either alone or in combination with Bavadekar fails to obviate applicants' invention, as recited in independent claim 1 (and claims 2, 4, and 5 which depend

there from). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. New Claims

Claims 54-56 have been added as new claims. Applicants' representative respectfully submits that, because new independent claim 54 recites aspects similar to claim 1, claim 54 and each of new claims 55-56 which depend on claim 54 are allowable for at least the same reasons provided for claim 1.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP2514US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/ Daniel Castro /
Daniel Castro
Reg. No. 60,359

TUROC & WATSON, LLP
127 Public Square
57TH Floor, Key Tower
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731